



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

RT

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/472,134 12/23/99 GIROUARD

B PM-265136

EXAMINER

PM82/0322

PILLSBURY MADISON AND SUTRO LLP  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP  
NINTH FLOOR  
1100 NEW YORK AVENUE NW  
WASHINGTON DC 20005-3918

BOEHLER.A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3618

DATE MAILED:

03/22/00

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/472,134

Applicant(s)  
Girouard et al.

Examiner  
Anne Marie Boehler

Group Art Unit  
3618



☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-83 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-83 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☒ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been  
☒ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 3611

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the toe-holds, recited in claims 63, 73, and 83, and the steering shaft positioned over the engine and at an angle of less than 45 degrees from vertical, claims 50-53 (fig. 3 shows the angle, but not the engine, while fig. 14 shows the engine under a steering shaft having an angle of more than 45 degrees from vertical) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.
2. The drawings are objected to because Figure 4 appears to show a position of the handlebar that is inconsistent with the snowmobile position shown in figures 2 and 3. In Figure 2, for example, the steering handlebars are shown so far forward that they almost touch the windshield. It would be impossible for the handlebars shown in Figure 2 to reach the 90 degree turn angle shown in Figure 4 because there is insufficient space behind the windshield. Correction is required.
3. The drawings are objected to because Figure 1 should be labeled "Prior Art". Correction is required.
4. Claims 1-49, 54-58, 61, 64-68, and 77-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant improperly defines his invention with respect to a rider's body. In many of the claims (for example claims 1-39), applicant defines the invention with respect to the rider's center of gravity. However, the rider himself (and his body parts and center of gravity) are not statutory

Art Unit: 3611

subject matter that may define a patentable claim. Also, every rider is different, so it would be impossible to determine the scope of the claim based on an unspecified rider.

Applicant uses terms such as "seat position", "steering position", and "footrest position" which are improperly defined in relation to the human body as well. For example, applicant explains, on page 9, line 9-15, that "the rider will be positioned on seat 128 so that he occupies seat position 130". The seat has a longitudinally elongated support surface, as seen in the drawings (fig. 2, for example) which could define a number of seat positions. Therefore, applicant has defined his "seat position" based on a "standard person" sitting a few seconds after starting the vehicle, heading straight ahead on flat terrain. The actual "seat position" is defined by a line from the rider's shoulder to hip at its intersection point with the seat while the rider is compressing the cushioning of the seat. Therefore, the "seat position" is defined by the user, his weight and measurements at any given time, and where he chooses to position his body while riding the vehicle. This improperly incorporates the user into the claimed combination and is impermissible.

In claim 58, applicant claims to user's head position which, again, is an improper recitation of the rider.

5. Claims 1-58, 60-61, and 64-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 3611

Claims 1-49, 54-58, 61, 64-68, and 77-83, which recite structural limitations with respect to their relationship to portions of a human being or "rider", are indefinite because the relationship of parts is not based on any known standard for sizing the vehicle to a rider, but rather on a rider of unspecified build. Such recitations include the "center of gravity of the snowmobile with the rider" (claims 1, 6, 36), "center of gravity of the rider" (claim 16, 20, 26, 30, 36, 61), "seat position", "footrest position", and "steering position" recited (claims 40, 44, 45, 46, 55, 64, 77, 81, and 82), "the rider space" (claim 54), and "the rider's head" (claim 58).

In claim 1, last line, "between about 0 cm and 14 cm" is indefinite because there is nothing to indicate what range of specific activity is covered by the term "about". The same indefinite recitation of a range preceded by "about" appears in claims 2-43, 45-53, 55-57, 64-80, 82, and 83.

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 40, 41, 44-49, 63, 69-76, and 81-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yasui.

Yasui shows a snowmobile with a seat position, footrest position and steering position that are illustrated by a rider shown in phantom in Figure 1. In the drawing the angles shown appear to correspond to those being claims, given a rider in the position shown. Sideboards are

Art Unit: 3611

shown from the side in fig. 1 and in top view on fig. 3. They appear to have a 5 degree downward slope to the front and a wall that inclines upwardly to form a toe-hold, as broadly recited and disclosed.

8. Claims 50, 51, and 54-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Marier.

Marier shows a snowmobile with a frame, an engine 17, and a steering shaft 104 connected to a ski 22. The steering shaft extends above the engine at an angle of less than 45 degrees from the vertical.

9. Claims 50-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yoshioka et al..

Yoshioka shows a snowmobile with a steering shaft angled at about 33 degrees from vertical and disposed above the engine 7.

10. Claims 59-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Husted.

Husted shows a snowmobile with a frame 13 and a forward most drive track axle 21 which is positioned behind the steering device 25. The center of gravity of the snowmobile as shown is behind the longitudinal center of the vehicle because most of the weight (from the motor and track) is at the rear of the vehicle). Therefore, the center of gravity of the vehicle is clearly rearward of the steering device 25, which is positioned entirely in front of the longitudinal center of the vehicle.

11. Claim 62 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Karpik.

Art Unit: 3611

Karpik shows a snowmobile with footrests positioned, shown in figure 3, behind the steering device and below the seat.

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasui.

The rider position shown appears to demonstrate angles of  $\alpha$  being about 98 degrees,  $\beta$  being about 44 degrees and  $\gamma$  being about 37 degrees. However, the angles are directly related to the exact positioning of the rider. The seat and footboards allow for a variety of positions, depending on the comfort and dimensions of the rider. Therefore, it would have been obvious for a rider who is taller than the rider shown to sit farther back on the seat, thereby altering the seat and footrest positions so they correspond to those claimed.

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Boyer and Sarra show windshield which appears to protect the rider's head from turbulent air flow.

Moss shows a snowmobile with footboards 110 which offer a large number of footrest positions and a seat which provides a range of seat positions.

Application/Control Number: 09/472,134

Page 7

Art Unit: 3611

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Boehler number is (703) 308-0422

*anBoehl 3/20/00*

**ANNE MARIE BOEHLER**  
**Primary Examiner**

boehler  
March 20, 2000